DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 532 EA 002 134

By-Seaberg, John J., Jr.; Liberty, Paul G., Jr.

Salient Areas of Conflict between Administration and Teachers in a Minimally Industrialized Area.

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Pub Date 6 Feb 69

Note-20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Amer. Educ. Res. Assn. (Los Angeles, Calif., Feb. 6, 1969).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10

Descriptors-*Administrative Personnel, Boards of Education, Collective Negotiation, *Conflict, Conflict Resolution, *Decision Making, Educational Facilities, Educational Finance, *Policy Formation, Public School Teachers, Questionnaires, School Superintendents, Statistical Analysis, Tables (Data), *Teacher Associations, Teacher Promotion, Teacher Selection, Teaching Conditions

Identifiers-AFT, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association, NEA, *New Mexico

A study sought to determine whether differences in opinion exist between school administration and teachers in six New Mexico school districts concerning (1) the degree of importance they attribute to certain areas of school policy formulation and decision making, (2) school policy areas which should involve teachers, and (3) methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals. Officers of NEA and AFT affiliates, along with school board members and higher echelon administrators, were given a three-part questionnaire. The responses were analyzed for significant differences by one-way analysis of variance. Results show salient differences in opinion between teachers and administrators regarding the importance of policies to determine teacher workloads, select instructional materials, evaluate buildings and facilities, determine extra duties for teachers, and plan staff meetings. Disagreement existed over whether teachers should be involved in determining qualifications for administrators, size of administrative staffs, promotion and retention of administrators, promotion and retention of instructional staff, and professional leave practices. Disagreement was also expressed over methods teachers should use to obtain their goals. Samples of the data collection instrument and statistical analyses tables are appended. (TT)

ED028532

Salient Areas of Conflict Between Administration and Teachers in a Minimally Industrialized Area

John J. Seaberg, Jr. and Paul G. Liberty, Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.
117 Richmond Drive, N. E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California, February 6, 1969.

EA 002 134

Salient Areas of Conflict Between Administration and Teachers in a Minimally Industrialized Area

John J. Seaberg, Jr. and Paul G. Liberty, Jr.

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

The demand by organized teachers to increasingly participate in the formulation of school district policies which concern them is one of the most salient problems confronting American education today. Local boards of education and administrators appear confused concerning what teachers really want and seem even more confused by the power play which militant teacher organizations have initiated.[1] Although it has been assumed that organized teacher groups desire to negotiate collectively on salaries and conditions of employment, very little work has been done to identify what teachers really consider to be the important policy areas requiring their participation and in determining the essential areas of disagreement in policy formulation between administration and teacher organizations. The present effort was concerned with investigating the range of views of administration and teacher organizations in a minimally industrialized region on selected school matters and noting those areas where teachers and administration are in apparent conflict. The particular questions posed by this paper are:

(1) What differences in opinion, if any, exist between school administration and teachers in the degree of importance they attribute to certain areas of school district policy formulation and decision-making?

(2) What differences of opinion, if any, exist between school administration and teachers in regard to school district policy areas which should involve teachers?

(3) Is there a difference in opinion between school administration and teachers concerning the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals?

Methodology

The study was limited to analyzing in a minimally industrialized state, the nature of the school administration-teacher organizations conflict in local school districts having both National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) affiliates. Although teacher militancy has not reached the proportions in minimally industrialized areas that is observable in highly industrialized states, such militancy is developing and, in all likelihood, will be increasing. By limiting the investigation to a single region, certain potentially influencing variables (such as presence or absence of labor unions, varying amounts of local monies available for education, differences in administrator and teacher certification, and degrees of cohesiveness of teachers' organizations) were held relatively constant.

Six public school districts in the State of New Mexico had both NEA and AFT affiliates, and these six districts comprise the teacher organizations sample. The decision to use local NEA and AFT affiliates officers and ex-officers in each of the sample districts rather than the run-of-the-mill membership was prompted by the belief that officers had most clearly internalized the values of their organization and would be responding on this basis.

In the same districts, the upper echelon of the local school administration (superintendent, assistant superintendent, and business manager) plus members of the local board of education were selected as the administration sample.

A three-part Likert-type questionnaire was developed. Part One, composed of 44 items, used a four-point scale ranging from "little or no importance" to

"very important" to determine the subject's estimate of the importance of selected areas of school district policy-making. Part Two, using the same 44 items from Part One, utilized a 4-point scale from "never" to "always" to determine the degree to which the respondent believes teachers should be involved in decision-making. Part Three asked about the methods teachers should employ to obtain their goals of involvement in certain school district policy decisions. The choices in Part Three were: (1) None, (2) Informal Teacher-Administrator Contacts, (3) Professional Negotiations Only, (4) Collective Bargaining Only, (5) Sanction When Professional Negotiations Have Failed, and (6) Strikes When Collective Bargaining has Failed.

Analyses were made from the 90 completed questionnaires received, which represented a 62% questionnaire return. One-way analysis of variance was used to investigate whether significant differences existed between the groups on each of the 44 items of the questionnaire. Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was used to assess the similarity of the three groups' rankings for Part Three of the questionnaire.

Findings and Implications

Analyses of the questionnaire's broad areas of school district policy formulation are used to report the investigations findings and to point out the implications for education. Implications are made in relation to the extent of the study's sample; therefore, inferences probably are applicable to areas of the United States which are not heavily industrialized and not proximate to strongly unionized organizations. Selected sources from the literature are used to support the inferences in some instances. Samples of the data collection instrument and partial results are contained in the Appendix.

Collective Negotiations

A significant difference among NEA affiliate officers, AFT affiliate officers and administration was noted for thirteen of the forty-four questionnaire items regarding the importance of certain school district policies. Both teacher groups agreed on district policy importance; the salient differences occurred between teachers and administration. Highly significant differences between administration and both teacher groups were discerned in the importance of policies to determine teacher work load, select instructional materials, evaluate existing buildings and facilities provided for the instructional programs, determine extra duties for teachers and determine the length, content and number of instructional staff meetings.

Significant differences among the groups were discerned for thirty of the forty-four items on determining the degree of involvement teachers or their local affiliate representatives should have in district policy formulation and decision-making. With this issue, also, there was general agreement between the teacher groups -- the outstanding differences occurred between teachers and administration. Divergent views between administration and teachers were noted in policies to: determine qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions, determine the promotion and retention of instructional personnel, select and recommend instructional personnel, determine the size of the administrative staff, determine the responsibilities of the administrative staff, determine extra duties for teachers, determine professional leave practices and determine the promotion and retention of administrative personnel. In these policy formulation areas, NEA and AFT affiliate officers believed teachers should be involved in the decisions to a greater extent than did administration.

According to the findings there is little disagreement between the two teacher organizations on such items as the importance of such issues as, the degree of teacher participation in decisions and the method which should be used to accomplish teacher involvement in the decisions. Despite some differences in stated purposes the two organizations have remarkably close interests and attitudes.

Pupil Personnel

Responses to questionnaire items regarding practices of pupil control, student graduation requirements, standards for student dress and conduct and grade reporting practices indicated general agreement among the three groups concerning importance of policy, degree of teacher involvement, and the method teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives should use to be involved in these decisions. The method preferred by all three groups was informal teacher-administrator contacts.

Teachers and administration seem interested, primarily in their own welfare and are content to resolve pupil personnel issues on an informal basis. One gets the impression that students are rewarded if they accept school regulations and programs but if they seek innovations or unestablished considerations they are viewed as troublemakers. Pupil personnel, per se, is not a major concern of the NEA.[2] Although pupil personnel is an issue of the AFT,[3] it apparently does not have the same importance as teacher welfare. Such an attitude is viewed as alarming when educational programs for minority groups are considered.

As pointed out by Ulibarri, teachers fail to discern most of the socio-cultural differences that impinge on the education of the children from varying ethnic groups. Many teachers do not understand the concepts of socio-cultural

considerations for the education of minority children or are unable to analyze the situations in terms of the concepts.[4] Study responses indicated that the same may be said of administration.

Professional Staff Personnel -- Teachers

A great deal of conflict was indicated within the educational enterprise with regard to school district policies concerning the qualification, selection, supervision, promotion, retention and recommendation of instructional personnel. Mean responses indicated that both teacher groups desired to participate in these decisions to a much greater degree than administration believed they should. Generally, AFT affiliate officers preferred a greater degree of teacher participation in the decisions than did their NEA counterparts and they had fewer items on which a significant difference was noted when Part One and Part Two of the questionnaire were compared. Moreover, the response standard deviations for the AFT officers were smaller than those of the other two groups indicating greater similarity between AFT officers than between NEA officers. Considerable conflict was also noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in professional staff decisions. For the most part, administration preferred informal teacher-administrator contracts whereas NEA and AFT affiliate officers desired collective negotiation procedures or sanctions and strikes.

Teachers often are criticized because they do not police their own ranks. They traditionally have preferred the principle of seniority to any system of relating rewards to qualitative assessment of performance.[5] Questionnaire responses showed AFT and NEA affiliate officers as definitely desiring a voice in qualifying, selecting, supervising, promoting, retaining and recommending the instructional staff. Results suggest that teachers desire to utilize the

hospital organizational model whereby wide areas of decision-making are beyond the determination of administrators and are governed by the professional staff. Responses of administration, on the other hand indicated a desire for continued control of these decisions through little or no teacher participation or informal teacher-administrator contacts. The smaller response standard deviations of the AFT affiliate officers indicates greater homogeneity and cohesiveness than for NEA affiliate officers. This pattern portends potential active conflict between AFT affiliate officers and administration.

Since teachers preferred collective negotiations and administration favored informal teacher-administrator contacts as a means of involving teachers in professional staff decisions, implications for the preparation of school administrators were discerned. Inclusion of conflict resolution training along the lines of the model utilized by industry certainly seems to be in order for school administrator training programs.

Professional Staff -- Administration

The statistical analyses for these questionnaire items indicated serious conflict between teachers and administration regarding the degree of teachers involvement in school policies in determining the qualifications, selection, responsibilities, retention, promotion, recommendation and size of the administrative staff. Mean responses showed that both teacher groups desired to participate in these decisions to a much greater degree than administration believed they should. Evidence of marked conflict also was noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in these decisions. Administration felt teachers should not be involved in these decisions whereas NEA and AFT affiliate officers preferred collective negotiation procedures as the method of teacher participation.

Administration strongly believes that teachers should not be involved in decisions regarding the administrative staff. If teacher organizations are successful in winning local collective negotiation agreements, one can imagine that they could use policies related to administrative staff personnel as a lever at the bargaining table to win greater teacher participation in instructional staff decisions. Teachers might then operationalize policing of their ranks by electing colleagues, whose competence is accepted by their peers, to participate in district decisions concerning the instructional staff.

Part Two of the questionnaire also yielded the interesting news that teachers question the competence of administrators to exercise supervisory authority but they felt themselves qualified to be involved with selecting, recommending, promoting, and retaining administrative personnel.

School Plant

Although considerable agreement was noted regarding the importance of school plant policies to chart the building program and determine building maintenance practices, a conflict was discerned concerning evaluation of existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs. Mean responses indicated that both teacher groups believed policies for this purpose to be more important than did administration.

Administration and NEA affiliate officers agreed regarding the degree to which teachers should be involved in planning the building program and determining building maintenance practices. AFT affiliate officers, however, preferred that teachers have a greater voice in these decisions. Considerable conflict also was noted regarding the method teachers should use to be involved in school plant decisions. Generally, administration and NEA affiliate officers

preferred informal teacher-administrator contacts while affiliate officers of the AFT favored collective negotiation procedures.

Teachers view school plant decisions as conditions of employment, in terms of their desire to teach in the best possible physical facilities, and in terms of curriculum whereas administration views school plant matters from a purely physical standpoint, such as an appropriate square footage for X classrooms, Y teachers, and Z students. Conflict among the groups regarding school plant decisions was another indication that greater disagreement existed between AFT affiliate officers and Administration than between officers of NEA affiliates and Administration.

District Finance and Business Management

Conflict was discerned between administration and teachers concerning the degree to which teachers should be involved in district finance and business management decisions. Included in this classification were policies regarding the basis and levels of the salary schedule, terms of contracts, planning of the budget, compensation for extra duties, non professional outside employment practices, district pay procedures, and financial needs and expenditure plans (other than salaries). Salient differences between teachers and administration were noted when the groups considered the method teachers should use to be involved in district financial decisions. Administration preferred informal teacher-administration contacts but teacher affiliate officers favored collective negotiations or strikes and sanctions.

It is reasonable to think that teachers desire status in the community, a respectable standard of living, and an opportunity to shape career plans, if so, money is essential if these desires are to be realized.

In this minimally industrialized state the majority of the support for local schools is appropriated by the state legislature forcing the local school administration into a precarious position. Many agencies must be supported by state revenue and education is only one of many organizations competing for such monies. Moreover, the minimal local support levy is governed by statute. Administration's dilemma is financing the ongoing organization while satisfying the salary demands of the professional staff.

During legislative sessions NEA and AFT affiliate representatives and administration present separate educational program and financial proposals. Each organization works assiduously for approval of its proposals, and violently opposes the recommendations of the other educational groups. The legislature, not surprisingly, seizes this opportunity to astutely maneuver these factions into an intra-educational battle while it allocates funds as it pleases with minimal effective pressures and few constructive recommendations from education.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate the nature of the conflict, within the educational enterprise, between administration and teacher organizations in policy formulation and decision-making in a minimally industrialized state. To find answers to the study's questions, a forty-four item questionnaire was developed and local districts having both NEA and AFT affiliates were selected as the study's sample.

With regard to the importance of having specific, written school district policies, a significant difference among the three groups was noted for thirteen of the forty-four selected policy questionnaire items. Both teacher groups

were in agreement on the importance of those school district policy items selected for study. The salient differences occurred between teachers and administration in school district policies to: (1) determine teacher work load, (2) select instructional materials, (3) evaluate existing buildings and facilities for the instructional program, (4) determine extra duties for teachers, and (5) determine the length, content and number of instructional staff meetings.

Significant differences among the groups were discerned for thirty of the forty-four items when determining the degree of involvement for teachers or their local affiliate representatives in district policy formulation and decision-making. With this issue, also, there was general agreement between the teacher groups -- the salient differences occurred between teachers and administration. Divergent views between administration and teachers were noted in policies to: (1) determine qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions, (2) determine the promotion and retention of instructional personnel, (3) determine the size of the administrative staff, (4) determine the responsibilities of the administrative staff, (5) determine extra duties for teachers, (6) determine professional leave practices, and (7) determine the promotion and retention of administrative personnel.

Marked differences were noted between the teacher groups and administration in the methods they believed teachers should use to accomplish their goals. The areas of professional personnel, district finance, and business management stand out. Administration responses on these issues ranged from none to informal teacher-administrator contacts whereas teacher responses ranged from collective negotiations to strikes and sanctions.

The study's findings point out definite implications for education in the areas of group coalitions regarding educational issues, student personnel policies, policing of their ranks by teachers and the preparation of school administrators.

Recommendations

1. Teachers should be given the opportunity to police their own ranks by electing colleagues, whose competence is accepted by their peers, to participate in qualifying, selecting, supervising, promoting, retaining, and recommending the local instructional staff.

2. The AFT and NEA affiliates should form a coalition and vigorously support local issues which would improve the educational enterprise.

3. Institutions which prepare school administrators should utilize the behavioral science approach to school administration with a portion of the seminar instruction and field experiences devoted to collective negotiations.

4. Student personnel policies should be incorporated into collective negotiation agreements to help insure that all students receive the educational preparation which will enable them to develop their unique abilities and become contributing societal members.

5. In states which finance the major portion of local education, Administration and NEA and AFT affiliate officers should join forces to present a united coalition during legislative appropriation sessions and vigorously support joint proposals to increase educational financial support and improve the state's educational programs.

Notes

1. Norman J. Boyan, "The Emergent Role of the Teacher and the Authority Structure of the School," Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas, 1967), p. 10.

2. National Education Association, NEA Handbook (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966). p. 15.

3. American Federation of Teachers, Constitution of the American Federation of Teachers (Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, October, 1964), p. 3.

4. Horacio Ulibarri, "Teacher Awareness of Socio-Cultural Differences in Multi-Cultural Classrooms" (Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, University of New Mexico), p. 118.

5. Boyan, op. cit., p. 8.

A P P E N D I X

Samples of the data collection instrument and statistical analyses tables are attached. Complete copies are available from the authors upon request.

Part 1

With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies:

Circle only one choice.

	Little or No Importance			Very Important
1. To determine teacher work load?	1	2	3	4
2. To determine qualifications for applicants for instructional staff positions?	1	2	3	4
3. To determine qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions (other than that of superintendent)?	1	2	3	4
4. To determine practices of pupil control?	1	2	3	4
5. To determine the school calendar?	1	2	3	4
6. To determine the duties of instructional staff members?	1	2	3	4
7. To determine the basis and levels of the salary schedule?	1	2	3	4
8. To determine curriculum content?	1	2	3	4
9. To determine district insurance programs for teachers?	1	2	3	4
10. To determine orientation procedures for the instructional staff?	1	2	3	4
11. To determine qualifications for applicants for the position of superintendent?	1	2	3	4
12. To determine in-service procedures?	1	2	3	4
13. To select instructional materials?	1	2	3	4
14. To evaluate existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs?	1	2	3	4

Part 2

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved:

Circle only one choice.

	Never	Occasionally	Usually	Always
1. In determining teacher work load?	1	2	3	4
2. In determining qualifications for applicants for instructional staff positions?	1	2	3	4
3. In determining qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions (other than that of superintendent)?	1	2	3	4
4. In determining practices of pupil control?	1	2	3	4
5. In determining the school calendar?	1	2	3	4
6. In determining the duties of instructional staff members?	1	2	3	4
7. In determining the basis and levels of the salary schedule?	1	2	3	4

Part 3

What method should teacher organizations employ to obtain this goal? Circle only one choice.

	None	Informal Teacher-Adm. Contacts	Professional Neg. Only	Collective Barg. Only	Sanctions when Prof. Neg. Have Failed	Strikes when Col. Barg. Has Failed
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10
	5	6	7	8	9	10

TABLE 1

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT ITEMS FOR PART 1 OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

With regard to school district decision-making, how important is it to have specific, written policies:	Administration N = 21		NEA Officers N = 36		ANOV F
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
1. To determine teacher work load?	3.0000	0.6172	3.6944	0.5686	17.91[a]
5. To determine the school calendar?	2.0952	0.7499	2.8056	0.9950	7.76[a]
12. To determine in-service procedures?	2.4752	0.9050	3.1111	0.8425	6.87[b]
13. To select instructional materials?	2.5238	1.0519	3.4444	0.7974	13.40[a]
14. To evaluate existing buildings and facilities provided for instructional programs?	2.6190	0.8438	3.2500	0.8292	7.31[a]

ITEM	NEA Officers N = 36		AFT Officers N = 33		ANOV F	Administration N = 21		AFT Officers N = 33		ANOV F
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	
1.	3.6944	0.5686	3.7576	0.4942	0.23	3.0000	0.6172	3.7576	0.4942	23.85[a]
5.	2.8056	0.9950	3.1515	0.9573	2.10	2.0952	0.7499	3.1515	0.9573	17.71[a]
12.	3.1111	0.8425	3.1818	0.8688	0.11	2.4752	0.9050	3.1818	0.8688	7.88[a]
13.	3.4444	0.7974	3.2424	0.9544	0.89	2.5238	1.0519	3.2424	0.9544	6.47[b]
14.	3.2500	0.8292	3.3939	0.6937	0.59	2.6190	0.8438	3.3939	0.6937	13.00[a]

[a]Significant difference at the .01 level.

[b]Significant difference at the .05 level.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

With regard to school district policy formulation and decision-making, to what degree should teachers and/or their local affiliate representatives be involved:	Administration N = 21		NEA Officers N = 36		Part 2	Part 3
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.	ANOV F	C of C W
11. In determining qualifications for applicants for the position of superintendent?	1.6667	0.9428	2.3889	1.0614	6.42[b]	.33
15. In determining sick leave practices?	3.2857	0.6999	3.7778	0.4157	10.70[a]	.56
16. In determining terms of contracts?	3.0952	0.8109	3.4722	0.8329	2.67	.56
17. In determining participation in public relation activities?	2.7619	0.9712	3.0000	0.7454	1.04	.81[d]
20. In determining the procedures for supervision of the instructional staff?	2.8571	0.9404	3.3889	0.7915	5.02[b]	.64
23. In determining the promotion and retention of instructional personnel?	2.4285	0.9548	3.2222	0.8535	10.13[a]	.64

ITEM	NEA Officers N = 36		AFT Officers N = 33		ANOV F	Administration N = 21		AFT Officers N = 33		ANOV F	C of C W
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		
11.	2.3889	1.0614	3.1212	1.1744	7.19[a]	1.6667	0.9428	3.1212	1.1744	22.00[a]	.33
15.	3.7778	0.4157	3.6364	0.6428	1.16	3.2857	0.6999	3.6364	0.6428	3.43	.56
16.	3.4722	0.8329	3.8485	0.4998	4.92[b]	3.0952	0.8109	3.8485	0.4998	17.17[a]	.56
17.	3.0000	0.7454	3.3333	0.5817	3.63	2.7619	0.9712	3.3333	0.5817	6.20[b]	.81[d]
20.	3.3889	0.7915	3.5758	0.6528	1.10	2.8571	0.9404	3.5758	0.6528	10.56[a]	.64
23.	3.2222	0.8535	3.6667	0.6817	5.48[b]	2.4285	0.9548	3.6667	0.6817	29.67[a]	.64

[a]Significant difference at the .01 level.

[b]Significant difference at the .05 level.

[c]P = +.05

[d]P = +.10

TABLE 3

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR EACH GROUP COMPARING, BY ITEM, PART 1 WITH PART 2 OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

ITEM	Administration Part 1 Mean	Part 1 S. D.	Part 2 Mean	Part 2 S. D.	ANOV F
1. Teacher work load.	3.0000	0.6172	3.2381	0.6098	1.51
2. Qualifications for applicants for instructional staff positions.	3.6667	0.8438	2.3810	0.9500	25.14[a]
3. Qualifications for applicants for administrative staff positions.	3.8095	0.4994	1.7143	0.9331	73.38[a]
4. Practices of pupil control.	3.4762	0.6633	3.3810	0.7854	0.17
5. School calendar.	2.0952	0.7499	3.2857	0.6281	29.62[a]
6. Duties of instructional staff members.	3.2857	0.7649	3.0952	0.7499	0.63
7. Basis and levels of the salary schedule.	3.5714	0.8492	3.6667	0.4714	0.19

ITEM	NEA Affiliate Officers Part 1 Mean	Part 1 S. D.	Part 2 Mean	Part 2 S. D.	ANOV F	AFT Affiliate Officers Part 1 Mean	Part 1 S. D.	Part 2 Mean	Part 2 S. D.	ANOV F
1.	3.6944	0.5686	3.5833	0.5951	0.64	3.7576	0.4942	3.9091	0.2875	2.25
2.	3.6944	0.5686	2.8333	1.0408	18.45[a]	3.6970	0.5766	3.5758	0.6976	0.57
3.	3.5278	0.7633	2.5278	1.0134	21.74[a]	3.8182	0.4576	3.3939	0.6937	8.34[a]
4.	3.3611	0.9473	3.3889	0.8589	0.02	3.3030	0.8699	3.6667	0.5318	4.07[b]
5.	2.8056	0.9950	3.4167	0.7949	8.06[a]	3.1515	0.9573	3.3939	0.8506	1.15
6.	3.6667	0.6236	3.3611	0.9762	2.44	3.6970	0.6269	3.6667	0.6817	0.03
7.	3.7778	0.5827	3.8333	0.3727	0.23	3.8788	0.3264	3.9394	0.2386	0.72

[a]Significant difference at the .01 level.

[b]Significant difference at the .05 level.